

Commonweal
6 Dec 1968

CORRESPONDENCE

NEWS & VIEWS: 330

CORRESPONDENCE: 331

Infallibility

Philadelphia

To the Editors: I was delighted to read on the cover of October 18, 1968 the title of Bishop Simons' lead article, for I feel that this area of theology deserves much study and thought. After a few readings, however, a wave of disappointment covered my mind and this—on three counts.

Apologetics: To say the very least the apologetic approach of the Bishop is quite fundamentalistic and obsolete. He speaks in terms of proving and of demonstrating scientifically papal infallibility from the Scriptures. I don't know if this can and/or should be done? Also, speaking on the act of faith, Bishop Simons bespeaks the necessity of certain knowledge of the fact of Revelation and how this fact cannot be based on papal infallibility. Right! But, perhaps, other requirements could, such as confidence in, respect for and solidarity with the Church and the Pope. Overly cerebral and intellectualist is the Bishop.

Holy Spirit: I was shocked by the statement that the only role of the Spirit in the Church is a negative one. A *superficial* perusal of St. John Chrysostom's Liturgy will quickly show the opposite as will the universal teaching of the Eastern churches. I cannot see how one can discuss the infallibility of the Pope and/or the Church without allotting the Holy Spirit THE function of guiding, inspiring, assisting and inhering in the Church. Perhaps a sound and complete Pneumatology should be the *point de départ* of a tract on infallibility rather than an outdated apologetics.

Ecclesiology: To my mind the lacuna here is the consideration of the Church in terms of the old static pyramidal institution rather than in terms of the earthly prolongation and continuation of Christ in His Spirit. In a very real sense, then, the Church is Christ and THIS is why it is infallible. The Pope, as its Head and Christ's chosen Vicar, has to share in a certain degree this
(Continued on page 361)

EDITORIALS: 331

'TRUTH CREATES ITS OWN ROOM': Philip Berrigan 333
AN ELECTED BISHOP IN AMERICA?: Thomas Bird 334
BIRTH PAINS FOR THE LOYAL OPPOSITION: A. V. Krebs, Jr. 335
SCHILLEBEECKX: THE TRIAL ON TRIAL: Henry ten Kortenaar 337
SCHILLEBEECKX: THE IDEAS ON TRIAL: Leonard F. X. Mayhew 338
THE TAMING OF PERU: Robert J. Alexander 340
STRIKING TEACHERS & LOCAL CONTROL: An Exchange of Views 344
VERSE: John Fandel 343
THE STAGE: Gerald Weales 350 **THE SCREEN:** Philip T. Hartung 351
BOOKS: 352
CRITICS' CHOICES FOR CHRISTMAS: 354

JAMES O'CARA: Editor
 JOHN DEEDY: Managing Editor
 PETER STEINFELS: Associate Editor
 ANNE ROBERTSON: Editorial Assistant JONATHAN EISEN: Editorial Assistant
 MICHAEL NOVAK: Associate Editor (At Large) WILFRID SHEED: Books
 GERALD WEALES: Drama PHILIP T. HARTUNG: Movies JOHN FANDEL: Poetry
 ROBERT BARRAT: Paris GUNNAR D. KUMLIEN: Rome J. M. CAMERON: Great Britain
 EDWARD S. SKILLIN: Publisher
 JOHN BRUBAKER: Advertising Manager

COMMONWEAL A Weekly Review of Public Affairs, Literature and the Arts.
 Second-class postage paid in Philadelphia, Pa. Printed in the USA and published weekly,
 except biweekly Christmas-New Year's and July-September,
 by Commonwealth Publishing Co, 232 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016
 Murray Hill 3-2042. Copyright © 1968 Commonwealth Publishing Co., Inc.
 US and Canada, \$10 a year. Foreign \$12. Single copies 35¢.

VIETNAM—THE BLEAK PROSPECT

Mr. Nixon having been President-elect for a month now without notable catastrophe befalling the Union, the temptation is to breathe easily. Things won't be so bad after all. Who knows?

No one does really know, of course, but fortune favors those who discount illusions. There are some hard facts of American political life which may well get lost in the attention devoted to rearranging the name-plates in Washington. "Mr. Nixon and his spokesmen are carrying out a perfectly respectable tradition—that of believing, perhaps, extravagantly, in their ability to make the government run in some rational way," comments the *Washington Post* on the Nixon reorganization efforts. The same attitude of skepticism is deserved on several other fronts.

The most important of these is in Southeast Asia. The conviction grows that the war in Vietnam is coming to an end, but no one seems to have a solid notion of how Nixon will accomplish what Johnson could not.

The situation stands roughly as follows. Militarily, the U.S. and Saigon have recovered somewhat from the nadir of Tet, but politically the Thieu government remains as unestablished as always, certain to be swept away with the removal of U.S. support. A new pacification drive is being mounted by Saigon; there is no reason why it should succeed where its predecessors failed. The war has de-escalated; each side, no doubt, hopes to gain something from the bombing halt: Hanoi, a diplomatic victory and respite for its people; the Vietcong, a chance to rebuild cadres sacrificed in the city strikes; the U.S., time to pursue its "Korean policy" of building up the ARVN and lowering American participation to a level acceptable at home.

Meanwhile, negotiations continue, not merely those in Paris—which may not be the crucial ones—but those between factions in Saigon; be-

tween elements in the State Department, the military and the CIA; between Hanoi, the N.L.F. and Russia; and perhaps, tacitly, between Washington and Moscow. The details of all this bowing and gesturing can obscure the central issue—who is going to rule South Vietnam—on which almost no compromise is in sight. The foot-dragging of Thieu and Co. has dominated the news, but, finally, it is understandable that the Saigon generals should hesitate to join in their own funeral march. Instead, they have volunteered to do business with the Vietcong if the latter will only renounce force, give up Communism and participate in elections, presumably under Saigon's Constitution and control. That is to say, if the Vietcong will only surrender. Nixon pledges to end the war by negotiations—and also never to impose a coalition on Saigon. If some men in the present government have finally concluded that these two pledges cancel one another out, there is no indication that the Nixon people won't have to learn the lesson afresh, losses in Vietnam and civil strife here being again the appointed teachers. No one dares talk nowadays of a 15-year war or "the task of a generation." But unless the protest movement convinces America that peace, domestic problems and salvaging whatever safety can be had for the Vietnamese, should take priority over preserving a non-Communist bastion in Vietnam, then the war may continue endlessly.

PUBLISH OR PERISH

Before its acquisition by the *Reader's Digest* three years ago, Funk and Wagnalls was best known as the publisher of that dictionary with the funny name. Since then it has been publishing furiously, its list highlighted by titles like *America is in Danger*, by Gen. Curtis LeMay.

On Dec. 11, just in time for the Christmas season, they will publish *The Fall of Khrushchev* by William Hyland and Richard Wallace Shryock.

Most books of this caliber have a substantial credit line for their authors, often including intimate detail about the author's second wife's third husband. Hyland and Shryock's blurb is bleak: "William Hyland and Richard W. Shryock, longtime students of Soviet affairs, are currently employed by the Federal government."

Our suspicions aroused, we called the publicity department of Funk and Wagnalls to inquire if the identity of the authors could be made any more specific. We were told that instructions had been left with them that the nature of the authors' employ was not to be divulged to anyone, and that included Catholic journals. In the face of that rebuff, *Commonweal* placed a person-to-person call to Mr. Hyland at the Central Intelligence Agency (202/351-1100). Hyland himself was unapologetic about all the secrecy: he readily admitted working for

the CIA, acknowledged the book was his, and insisted that the dodge was in order to insure that "no one would get the idea that the book represented official policy of the CIA." He conceded that there might have been better ways to conceal his identity since now people might get the idea that the Agency was still funnelling its stuff out to the public under various covers.

A call to the U.S. Information Agency, which was caught in 1966 by Congressman Lipscomb of California in the act of subsidizing publishing concerns, revealed that *The Fall of Khrushchev* is currently being considered for distribution abroad. The woman there is Harriet Baumgartner, Chief of the Appraisals Branch.

There was no record at Funk and Wagnalls on how the book came to be placed with them. The Executive Editor, Emile Capouya, denied that any advance orders had been placed for the book by any Federal agency.

Funk and Wagnalls executives were somewhat anxious about the book, and they debated the advisability of publishing it without identifying the authors. But the result of their deliberations was that if they did not publish it, some other publisher would. Moreover, there was some sympathy for the efforts of the Agency to legitimize itself by publishing books of high academic caliber. How this was possible if the CIA were not credited on the book was not entirely clear, but there are indications that *Khrushchev* is just one of several books like it to follow. It all comes down to image building, we were told, improving the name of the CIA on the campus, where relations have become strained in recent years.

Funk and Wagnalls was in the news last summer in another case of unprofessional publishing. Having assured F & W editors that there would be freedom on editorial matters, *Reader's Digest* Executive Editor Hobart Lewis decided to bump Sam Baker's *The Permissible Lie*—a book critical of the advertising industry—from its list, after several thousand copies had already been printed. The reason: "We simply don't want to sponsor Mr. Baker's message." As for the independence of Funk and Wagnalls from *Digest* policies, Lewis merely commented: "We'll have a closer liaison from now on."

It is not clear from this instance that the *Digest* is operating as a CIA conduit—perhaps it's the other way around. What is apparent is that last year's disclosures of CIA infiltration of allegedly private organizations did not serve to change these practices if the publication of *The Fall of Khrushchev* is any indication—despite the pledges of Roger Helms and Secretary Rusk.

Perhaps the *Digest* and Funk and Wagnalls people should take another look at their own promotional copy for *The Permissible Lie*: "False claims, cleverly distorted copy, and even downright lies are the habitual language of much of our television, radio, and magazine advertising. . . . Baker shows . . . how misleading claims damage the product, the public, the agency that prepares the copy, and the medium that carries the message. . . ."